



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 11, 2021

Ms. Mandy Haynes  
Paralegal  
The City of Big Spring  
310 Nolan Street  
Big Spring, Texas 79720-2657

OR2021-03854

Dear Ms. Haynes:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 866294 (PIR Nos. 089-2020, 090-2020, & 091-2020).

The City of Big Spring and the Big Spring Police Department (collectively, the "city") received three requests from different requestors for information pertaining to a specified incident involving a named individual.<sup>1</sup> You state the city will release some of the requested information. You state the city does not maintain information responsive to a portion of the third request.<sup>2</sup> You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection,

---

<sup>1</sup> The city states the third requestor modified her request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

<sup>2</sup> The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why this exception is applicable to the information at issue. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state the submitted information relates to a pending criminal investigation or prosecution. Based on this representation, we conclude release of the information you have marked will interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the information at issue. Accordingly, we find the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. In Open Records Decision No. 393 (1983), this office concluded generally, only information that either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense may be withheld under common-law privacy; however, because the identifying information was inextricably intertwined with other releasable information, the governmental body was required to withhold the entire report. ORD 393 at 2; *see* Open Records Decision No. 339 (1982); *see also Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (identity of witnesses to and victims of sexual harassment was highly intimate or embarrassing information and public did not have a legitimate interest in such information). The Third Court of Appeals has concluded public citizens’ dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *See Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). We note an individual’s name, address, and telephone number are generally not private information under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 554 at 3 (1990) (disclosure of person’s name, address, or telephone number not an invasion of privacy). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. We note the third requestor is an authorized representative of one of the involved individuals. Thus, the third requestor has a right of access to her client’s confidential information pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.023(a) (“person’s authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person’s privacy interests”); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Accordingly, with the exception of the date of birth of the third requestor’s client, which must be released to the third requestor, the city

---

<sup>3</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth, which you have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. With the exception of the date of birth of the third requestor's client, which must be released to the third requestor, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth, which you have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must release the remaining information.<sup>4</sup>

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Alexandra C. Burks  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ACB/jm

Ref: ID# 866294

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 3 Requestors  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>4</sup> We note the third requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. See Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Accordingly, if the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a ruling from this office. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302; Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001).